



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/502,210	07/21/2004	Christopher K. Haas	57787US007	1825
32692	7590	02/08/2006	EXAMINER	
3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY PO BOX 33427 ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427			DESAI, ANISH P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

1771

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

✓

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/502,210	Applicant(s) HAAS ET AL.	
	Examiner Anish Desai	Art Unit 1771	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07/21/04.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 July 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02/03/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 13,14, and 19-33 are objected to because of the following informalities:
The preamble of claim 13 is inconsistent with the preamble of claim 6 from which claim 13 depends. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 25 and 27 recite "polymer", there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3. Claims 1-10,20,21, and 25-30, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Perez et al. (WO 02/00982A1). US 6,468,451 to Perez et al. is relied on as an equivalent form of WO 02/00982A1 for convenience.

Perez et al. teach a high-melt strength oriented polypropylene foam articles (Column 1, lines 1-7). Additionally, at Column 14, lines 23-25, Perez et al. teach that polypropylene foam articles are suitable as receptive surface for printing. Perez et al. do not explicitly disclose a security element. However, since there are no structural limitations claimed with respect to the security element of the claimed invention such that the security element of the present invention as recited in claim 1 can be distinguished from the prior art print receptive, oriented, high melt strength polypropylene foam articles, it is the examiner's position that the polypropylene foam of Perez et al. with print receptive surface is capable of functioning as a security element. Regarding claims 2 and 3, since the print receptive surface of the polypropylene foam of Perez et al. is capable of being printed, the printed surface of polypropylene foam article reads on visual security element and printed indicia as claimed in claim 3. With respect to claims 4 and 5, Perez et al. teach fibrillation of the foam using a mesh pattern support screen, the resulting schistose surface bears a pattern resembling the wrap and weft of

Art Unit: 1771

a textile (Column 12, lines 20-25). Thus, the foam is embossed. With respect to claim 6, Perez et al. teach release coating comprising thermoplastic film (Column 16, lines 11-12) that is applied to the foam backing (Column 15, lines 48-50, Column 14, line 67).

The thermoplastic film layer of Perez et al. reads on the thermoplastic film layer as claimed in the present invention. With respect to claims 7 and 8, the thermoplastic film layer of the Perez et al. comprises pigments, which are considered as security element integral to the thermoplastic film layer as claimed in claim 7. With respect to claim 8, the printed surface of the polypropylene foam article reads on the security element integral to the foam layer as claimed in the claim 8. With respect to claim 9, the printed surface of Perez et al. reads on the security element selected from the group of printed indicia as claimed in the claim 9. With respect to claim 10, it seems that the printed surface of the polypropylene foam can be inherently be revealed through the foam.

With respect to claims 20 and 21, the recitations "thermoplastic film layer is co extruded with said film layer by an inclusion exclusion process", "security element is coextruded with said film layer by an inclusion coextrusion process" are directed towards product by process limitations. The products by process claims are not limited to the manipulations of the recited steps, only the structure implied by the steps. "Even though product by process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product by process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior

Art Unit: 1771

product was made by a different process." *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Once the Examiner provides a rationale tending to show that the claimed product appears to be the same or similar to that of the prior art, although produced by a different process, the burden shifts to applicant to come forward with evidence establishing an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product. *In re Marosi*, 218 USPQ 289, 292 (Fed. Cir. 1983). In the instantly claimed invention, the applicant is using an oriented, high melt-strength polypropylene foam layer, a thermoplastic film layer, and a security element. Perez et al. also teach high melt-strength polypropylene foam wherein the polypropylene foam has print receptive surface and a thermoplastic film layer.

With respect to claim 25, the melt-strength of polypropylene is in the range of 30 to 55 cN (Column 2, lines 63-65). With respect to claim 26, the polypropylene foam is stretched biaxially (Column 8, lines 50-51). Regarding claims 27-29, Perez et al. teach the foamable polypropylene consist of blends of propylene homopolymers and copolymers having 50 wt % or more propylene monomer (Column 3, lines 25-27). Moreover, Perez et al. teach propylene copolymer include random, block, and graft copolymers of propylene and olefin monomers selected from the group consisting of C3-C8 alpha olefins and C4-C10 dienes (Column 3, lines 32-36). Perez et al. further teach that other polymers such as ethylene/acrylic acid and ethylene vinyl acetate can be added to the polypropylene. Ethylene/acrylic acid and ethylene vinyl acetate are semicrystalline polymers. With respect to claim 30, the print receptive surface of

Art Unit: 1771

polypropylene foam read on the security element on a surface of the foam layer as claimed in claim 30. With respect to claim 33, although Perez et al. do not specifically disclose a security document, however it has been held that the recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed security substrate is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed printable substrate from a prior fibrillated foam satisfying the claimed structural limitations. Accordingly, it is the examiner's position that Perez et al. anticipate the claimed subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3,6-10,11,13,15-18,20-25, and 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emslander (US 4,733,786) in view of Tusim et al. (US 6,251,319).

Emslander teaches innerseal for bottles or other containers which will provide a visual indication if the innerseal has been previously tampered with (Column 1, lines 7-19). The innerseal comprises a facing layer 22, insulating layer 24, and a layer of thermally sensitive layer 26 (Column 3, lines 47-56). With respect to claim 1, the insulating layer 24 can be made of foam (Column 4, lines 35-36). The polymeric material used to make the insulating layer is polypropylene (Column 4, lines 45-47). Additionally, Emslander teaches a message indicating whether the innerseal has been

Art Unit: 1771

tampered is printed on the surface of the insulating layer (Column 4, lines 40-41 and Column 4, lines 43-45). Additionally, Emslander teaches the message can be also printed on the facing layer 22 (Column 5, lines 41-42) and on the thermally sensitive layer 26 (Column 5, lines 44-46). With respect to claim 1, the printed message of the Emslander reads on the claimed security element.

Emslander is silent as to teaching of oriented, high melt-strength polypropylene foam. However, Tussim et al. teach foam sheets for applications such as cups and bowls (Column 1, lines 14-15). The foam sheets of Tussim et al. comprises polypropylene having melt -strength in the range of from 25 to 60 cN measured at 190°C (Column 3, lines 11-14), which read on the high melt-strength polypropylene of instantly claimed subject matter. Moreover, the polypropylene foam sheet of Emslander is stretched (oriented) as seen in Example 4. According to Emslander the polypropylene foam sheet can be made closed-cell (Column 1, lines 58-60), which provides a good thermal, insulating capacity (Column 2, lines 19-20). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the polypropylene foam sheet of Tussim et al. as an insulating layer in the innearseal of Emslander, motivated by the desire to provide better thermal insulating capacity to the insulating layer.

With respect to claim 2, the printed message of the Emslander is visible and thus reads on the visual security element as claimed in claim 2.

Regarding claim 3, the printed message of Emslander reads on the printed indicia as claimed in claim 3.

With respect to claim 6, according to Emslander, the thermally sensitive layer 26 is made of materials described in US Patent No. 4,539,256 wherein the sheet materials described in US Patent No. 4,539,256 are made of thermoplastic polymers (Column 5, lines 15-20). Thus, the thermally sensitive layer 26 of Emslander reads on the claimed thermoplastic film layer.

With respect to claim 7, Emslander teaches the message can be printed on the thermally sensitive layer 26 (Column 4, lines 41-43). Thus, the printed message on the thermally sensitive layer reads on claimed security element integral to the thermoplastic film layer as claimed in claim 7.

Regarding claim 8, Emslander teaches the message can be printed on the foamed insulating layer (Column 4, lines 35-36 and Column 4, lines 43-45). Thus, the printed message on the foamed insulating layer reads on the security element integral to the foam layer as claimed in claim 8.

Regarding claim 9, the printed message of Emslander reads on the printed indicia as claimed in claim 9.

Regarding claim 10, Emslander teaches the message can be printed on the facing layer 22 if the insulating layer 24 is transparent (Column 5, lines 41-43).

Regarding claim 11, the printed messages as shown in Figure 5 and Figure 6 read on claimed two security elements in registration to provide a visual security element as claimed in claim 11.

Regarding claim 13, at Column 5, lines 47-52, Emslander teaches that rather than using a thermally sensitive layer that can be transformed from opaque to

Art Unit: 1771

transparent, the thermally sensitive layer can be made of a layer of transparent polymeric material bearing a thermally sensitive material such as composition comprising a leuco dye as described in US Patent No. 4,379,835. Additionally, Emslander teaches that a message can be printed directly on the thermally sensitive layer 26 with a thermally sensitive leuco dye and upon the exposure to heat the leuco dye will be converted to its colored form to reveal a warning message (Column 5, lines 47-61). The printed message with the leuco dye on the thermally sensitive layer of Emslander reads on the claimed security element comprising a core embedded in the thermoplastic film layer.

With respect to claim 15, Emslander teaches leuco dye compositions are as described in US Patent No. 4,379,835, which is incorporated in Emslander's teachings. The US Patent No. 4,379,835 teaches composition comprising polymeric binder with two leuco dyes (Column 1, lines 6-10, Column 2, lines 60-64 of US Patent No. 4,379,835). The binder comprising leuco dyes reads on the thermoplastic polymer having dyes as claimed in claim 15.

Regarding claim 16, the US Patent No. 4,379,835 teaches a binder material containing these ingredients can be colorized locally by heating portions of the binder layer or generally colorized by heating the entire layer (Column 1, lines 42-45 of US Patent No. 4,379,835) and thus reads on the core comprising colored polymer.

With respect to claims 17, 18, and 20, it is the examiner's position that recitations "security element is coextruded with said foam layer by an inclusion coextrusion process", "security element is coextruded with said film layer by an inclusion coextrusion

Art Unit: 1771

process", and "thermoplastic film layer is coextruded with said foam layer are directed to product by process limitations. The products by process claims are not limited to the manipulations of the recited steps, only the structure implied by the steps. "Even though product by process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product by process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Once the Examiner provides a rationale tending to show that the claimed product appears to be the same or similar to that of the prior art, although produced by a different process, the burden shifts to applicant to come forward with evidence establishing an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product. *In re Marosi*, 218 USPQ 289, 292 (Fed. Cir. 1983). In the instantly claimed invention, the applicant is using an oriented, high melt-strength polypropylene foam layer, a thermoplastic film layer, and a security element. Emslander as modified by Tussim et al. teach innerseal for bottles wherein the inneseal comprises a high melt-strength polypropylene foam layer, a thermally sensitive layer formed of thermoplastic polymers, and a printed message indicating whether the inneseal has been subjected to tampering. Thus, the inneseal of Emslander as modified by Tussim et al. is similar to the applicant's multilayer article comprising the oriented, high melt-strength polypropylene foam layer, a security element, and a thermoplastic film layer.

With respect to claim 21, Emslander teaches that insulating layer can be laminated to the thermally sensitive layer (Column 3, lines 63-64).

With respect to claims 22 and 23, Emslander teaches that the thermally sensitive layer can be made of material described in US Patent No. 4,539,256 (Column 5, lines 15-17). The US Patent No. 4,539,256 teaches oriented film at Column 3, line 5 and non-oriented (unoriented) film at Column 2, lines 5-6.

Regarding claim 24, although Emslander as modified by Tussim et al. do not explicitly teach the bending stiffness of at least 40 Newton, it is reasonable to presume that the innerseal of Emslander as modified by Tussim et al. comprises an oriented, high melt-strength polypropylene insulating layer laminated to a thermally sensitive layer formed of thermoplastic layer necessarily has a bending stiffness of at least 40 Newton because like material has like property. The applicant is using an oriented, high melt-strength polypropylene foam layer and a thermoplastic film layer. Emslander as modified by Tussim et al. also teach an oriented, high melt-strength polypropylene foam layer and a thermally sensitive layer comprising thermoplastic polymers. Thus, the innerseal of Emslander as modified by Tussim et al. is similar to the applicant's claimed multilayer substrate. Note that the reliance upon inherency is not improper even though the rejection is based on the 35 USC Section 103 instead of 35 USC Section 102.

With respect to claim 25, the foam sheets of Tussim et al. comprises polypropylene having melt -strength in the range of from 25 to 60 cN measured at 190°C (Column 3, lines 11-14).

Regarding claim 27, Tussim et al. teach polypropylene comprising at least 50 weight percent of propylene monomeric units (Column 3, lines 11-12) wherein the propylene polymer may comprise blend of propylene homopolymers and copolymers (Column 4, lines 1-5).

With respect to claim 28, Tussim et al. disclose propylene copolymers that include random, block, and grafted copolymers of propylene, and olefin selected from C4-C10 1-olefins, and C4-C10 dienes (Column 4, lines 10-15).

With respect to claim 29, Tussim teaches the polypropylene foam layer comprising ethylene/acrylic acid copolymer or ethylene/vinyl acetate copolymer (Column 4, lines 27-30), which are semicrystalline. Additionally, the amount of polypropylene is approximately 85% by weight (Column 3, lines 44) and therefore at most 15% by weight of the semicrystalline polymer is used which is considered to be a minor amount.

Regarding claims 30 and 31, according to Emslander, a message indicating whether the innerseal has been tampered is printed on the surface of the insulating layer (Column 4, lines 40-41 and Column 4, lines 43-45). Thus, the printed message is also considered to be dispersed in the foam layer.

With respect to claim 32, recall that Emslander teaches a message can be printed on the thermally sensitive layer 26 (Column 4, lines 41-43) and the insulating layer 24 can be laminated to the thermally sensitive layer (Column 3, line 63). Thus, the thermally sensitive layer 26 with printed message of Emslander, wherein the thermally

sensitive layer 26 is also considered to be laminated with the insulating layer 24 reads on the security element is laminated to said foam layer as claimed in claim 32.

With respect to claim 33, Emslander as modified by Tussim et al. does not disclose a security document. However, it has been held that a recitation with respect to manner in which a claimed security substrate is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed security substrate from a prior art innerseal satisfying the claimed structural limitations.

5. Claims 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emslander (US 4,733,786) in view of Tussim et al. (US 6,251,319) as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of Witkowski (US 5,525,383).

The invention of Emslander (US 4,733,786) as modified by Tussim et al. (US 6,251,319) is previously disclosed. Emslander is silent as to teaching of security element is a polarizing element or a moiré pattern. However, Witkowski teaches a container such as a bottle provided with moiré markings (Abstract). Moreover, Witkowski teaches a sleeve made of plastic film with moiré markings thereon (Column 2, lines 37-38 and Column 2, lines 43-44). Moiré markings on the sleeve as shown in Figure 3 read on plurality of laterally spaced cores embedded in the thermoplastic film layer as claimed in claim 14. Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the moiré markings as taught by Witkowski and printed a message on the innerseal of Emslander, motivated by the desire to easily draw the attention of consumers if the innerseal has been tampered with.

6. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perez et al. (WO 02/00982A1) as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, further in view of Mody et al. (US 5,605,729).

The invention of Perez et al. as applied to claims 1 and 6 is previously disclosed. Perez further teaches the article suitable as a loop fastener. Perez does not specifically disclose the article comprising two high melt-strength polymer foam layer and a thermoplastic film layer disposed there between. However, Mody et al. teach a loop fastener comprising two foam backings 16 and a loop layer 14 disposed as shown in Figure 1. Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the loop fastener having a layer construction as shown in the reference of Mody et al., because such is an intended use of the material and Mody provides necessary details to practice the invention of Perez et al.

7. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emslander (US 4,733,786) in view of Tussim et al. (US 6,251,319) as applied to claim 1 above, further in view of Dratz et al. (US 3,916,063).

The invention of Emslander as modified by Tussim et al. as applied to claim 1 is previously disclosed. Emslander and Tussim et al. are silent as to teaching of biaxial orientation of polypropylene foam. Further, Tussim et al. teach the polypropylene film to be uniaxial (stretched over a mandrel) as shown in Example 4. However, Dratz et al. teach polyolefin films that are used in a packaging industry (Column 1, line 4-5 and line 15). The polyolefin films include polypropylene (Column 2, line 61). Additionally, Dratz et al. teach the use of polypropylene film that is either with or without unilaterally of

Art Unit: 1771

bilateral orientation (Column 2, lines 63-65). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have employed biaxial polypropylene film as taught by Dratz, in the invention of Tussim et al. Because Dratz et al. teach that the use of whether a monoaxial (unilateral orientation) or biaxial (bilateral orientation) film would work equally well.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

8. Claims 1-33 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-26 of copending Application No. 10/502,229. Although the conflicting claims are not identical,

Art Unit: 1771

they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims of copending

Application No. 10/502,229, fully encompass the claimed subject matter.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anish Desai whose telephone number is 571-272-6467. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on 571-272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

APD



**HAIVO
PRIMARY EXAMINER**